UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,737	05/08/2006	Stephen L. Dole	128346.60901	5549
21269 7590 04/22/2008 PEPPER HAMILTON LLP				IINER
ONE MELLON CENTER, 50TH FLOOR 500 GRANT STREET			GROUP, KARL E	
PITTSBURGH,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/595,737	DOLE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Karl E. Group	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication  Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	's
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO y statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this commul. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed or     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)      Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice units.	This action is non-final.	•	rits is
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-20 is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-20 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction  Application Papers 9)  The specification is objected to by the Ex	ithdrawn from consideration.  and/or election requirement.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in a e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stag	ge
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	48) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 	

Application/Control Number: 10/595,737 Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-5,7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation ""the cBN particles in the sintered compact have less than 20% grain-to-grain bonding" is considered to render the claims indefinite since it is not clear if this limitation is drawn to 20% of each grain (20% of the surface area of each singular grain) or 20% of all the grains are bonded to each other. Therefor the metes and bounds of the claims cannot be determined.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 or 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1-5,7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Japanese document 1-122971, for reasons of record.
- 5. Claims 1-5,7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Japanese document 60-176973, for reasons of record.

6. Claims 1-4,9-13,18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Japanese document 56-112438, for reasons of record.

In view of the amendment to the claims requiring less than 20% grain to grain contact this rejection has been changed to 102/103.

It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

- 7. Claims 1-5,7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Japanese document 6333540, for reasons of record.
- 8. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Japanese document 9-15771, for reasons of record.

## Response to Arguments

Applicants argument that the prior art references fail to teach the newly added limitation "wherein the cBN particles have less than 20% of grain to grain bonding" is not persuasive in overcoming the rejections. Applicants have not shown by way of tangible evidence, in declaration form, that the prior art products are outside this limitation. Furthermore, it is not clear if this limitation is drawn to 20% of each grain (20% of the surface area of each singular grain) or 20% of all the grains are bonded to each other,

Application/Control Number: 10/595,737 Page 4

Art Unit: 1793

see above 112. Applicants further argue this limitation would not be inherent because the prior art fails to discuss "wherein the mixture is at least substantially homogeneous". This is not persuasive because the product claims do not require such a limitation. Secondly the limitation is considered qualitative and fails to clearly set forth a degree of homogeneity. Translations of Japanese document 1-22971, 60-176973 and 56-112438 have been provided herein. A machine translation of 9-15771 has previously been provided. With respect to Japanese document 63-33540 it is clear from page 223, that the processing parameters are within the instant claims. A translation has been ordered however was not received at the time of this office action. Furthermore, the compounds of the compositions recited in the tables of the Japanese documents are in English and are readily determined.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl E. Group whose telephone number is 571-272-1368. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Karl E Group/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793

Keg 4-14-08